

ResultsPlus

Examiners' Report
June 2011

GCE History 6HI01 E

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Alternatively, you can contact our History Advisor directly by sending an email to MARK BATTYE on HistorySubjectAdvisor@EdexcelExperts.co.uk.

You can also telephone 0844 576 0034 to speak to a member of our subject advisor team.



Get more from your exam results

...and now your mock results too!

ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam and mock performance, helping you to help them more effectively.

- See your students' scores for every exam question
- Spot topics, skills and types of question where they need to improve their learning
- Understand how your students' performance compares with Edexcel national averages
- Track progress against target grades and focus revision more effectively with NEW Mock Analysis

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus.

To set up your ResultsPlus account, call 0844 576 0024

June 2011

Publications Code US028130

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Edexcel Ltd 2011

Introduction

General comments

This is the third year of GCE 2008 and the sixth examination session for Unit 1. Candidates are now aware of how to approach the examination. They understand the need to produce a balanced answer, and they know that the most effective way to structure this answer is to make a number of relevant points, support these with examples, and establish clear links to the question set. However, many of these well-focused and organised answers remain at mid-Level 4 rather than progressing to the top of Level 4 and into Level 5. This is due to a variety of reasons including a need to inter-relate or evaluate the points being made more directly, a failure to cover the whole date range of the question, a lack of chronological awareness and a lack of the convincing support required to gain the higher level marks. Fewer answers than previously were awarded Levels 1 and 2. Most candidates appear to have gained something from their course, and thus are likely to be awarded at least Level 3. Almost all answers include some kind of plan, though some were very long and detailed, to the detriment of their answer overall.

Many candidates still struggle to maintain a focus on the question set. Some are quick to assume that the questions set are similar to those they have met while revising. They must remember that past questions are exactly that, and cannot appear again in the same form. They need to read the questions carefully and respond to what is asked, rather than what they hope to see or have practised during revision. Knowledge needs to be adapted and employed effectively, rather than taking the form of a prepared answer that may not focus on the question set.

Equally, candidates must ensure that their entire answer focuses on the question. Question D7 required an analysis of the consequences of collectivisation. However, a number of candidates began with a lengthy explanation of the reasons for the introduction of this policy. Similarly, Question D10 required a focus on the civil rights movement, yet many discussed Black Power in their answers. Question C6 was often focused on why the slave trade rather than slavery was abolished in 1807 rather than why it took so long for slavery to be abolished. These issues could be of some relevance, but were rarely made so.

Past reports have highlighted the importance of focusing on the timescale set in the question. Many otherwise strong answers were weakened, sometimes substantially, by failing to cover the period set. Question A11 targeted 1455-61, but many ignored this and wrote only on the causes of civil conflict. Question B1's timescale was 1517-25. Some ignored this completely, focusing instead on the long-term causes of the German Reformation. Question D11 set the parameters of 1954-63, yet many candidates discussed the roles of Truman and Johnson in their answers. Question E/F 5 required a discussion of the period from 1896-1922 but many responses focused entirely on the period from 1915 whilst Question E/F 6 covered the years 1925-1943 in Italy not the rise to power of the Fascist Party. An understanding of chronology, and the accurate use of dates, was often a factor which discriminated between Level 3 and Level 4 answers.

It seemed that many candidates did not have the specific knowledge which is essential for accessing the higher levels, but provided generalised examples which showed little depth. Dates, numerical evidence, reference to key individuals and events are all important if candidates are to produce a convincing analysis. If we assume that each topic is studied for at least six weeks, the majority of candidates should have this depth of knowledge.

Many candidates appear to have been armed with a writing template for their answers. The formula appeared to be taking note of the factor raised in the question and then mentioning that other factors (usually three) were also significant. Key marker phrases, such as 'however' and 'on the other hand' were then deployed before reaching some sort of conclusion. The use of these connecting phrases often seem impressive and do lead to a more organised answer but too many candidates increasingly employ them without a real understanding of how they should be used. In many responses the use of 'however', 'consequently' and 'therefore' just led to the introduction of another factor rather than creating a discussion of the points being made. This approach can work as long as effective links to the question are established. Several answers looked at other relevant factors but failed to establish their significance beyond asserting that they were important.

Those candidates who were well prepared in terms of knowledge and understanding of their topics produced answers within Levels 4 and 5, and some of these have been included in this report. For students who completed GCSE just one year earlier, the best answers are remarkable examples of young minds at work.

Question 1-12

Option E

General comments

As in previous examination series, the Option E/F candidates were generally very well prepared for the topics studied. Most candidates had at least sound knowledge of the content and were able to show understanding of key issues. Responses were found at all levels with many excellent level 5 responses seen, particularly for topic 1 and topic 2. However, it was noticeable this June that many good responses seemed to reach mid-level 4 but not progress further up the mark scheme. Most of these responses were able to provide a range of factors or yes/no points but did not go on to address the evaluative concepts of 'how far...', 'to what extent...', 'how significant...' etc. Alternatively there were many responses with well-developed conclusions reaching sound judgements that had not been convincingly or securely justified in the main body of the response. In particular, many of these responses were hampered by a lack of chronological awareness within the time-frame of the question. There were many examples of candidates with sound knowledge of events or individuals but responding with little regard to the context or chronological order in which developments happened. For example, responses to Q3 on Bismarck's diplomacy including paragraphs within which there were references to the war with Denmark followed by the Franco-Prussian war and then moving back to discuss war with Austria with little acknowledgement of chronology or dates.

NB – please note that the comments on individual questions are applicable to Q1-Q12 for Option F as well. There may, however, be added exemplification scripts in the Option F report and so it is suggested that centres refer to both Principal Examiner reports.

Topic E/F1 – The Road to Unification: Italy, c1815-1870.

This is a very popular topic for Option E centres and candidates are invariably very well prepared. Q2 was more popular than Q1 but there was a healthy balance between the two. Most candidates for this topic have a good understanding of the chronology of events but many responses lack coverage of the whole time period within the question set. There are some factual errors beginning to creep into answers and there are an increasing number of candidates who do not seem to be aware that Cavour died in 1861 and so giving him a leading role in the acquisition of Venetia in 1866.

Q1. Most candidates were secure in their knowledge of the provisions of the Vienna Settlement with regard to Italy and were, thus, able to create a discussion of the changes that occurred in the following years. Answers were differentiated by those who were able to directly compare the extent to which the settlement had been overthrown by 1849 and those who narrated the events of the revolutions in between with varying degrees of secure knowledge. Most candidates were able to refer to the extent to which Austrian power was challenged and there were some perceptive comments about the extent to which the events of 1848-9 may have appeared to have achieved little but prepared the ground for future

events. At level 5 candidates were able to compare directly the situation in 1815 and 1849 and select relevant and appropriate supporting material from the intervening years to make points about Austrian influence, revolutionary weaknesses and the development of nationalist ideology.

Q2. Most candidates who attempted this question were secure in their knowledge of the events of the period but many were unwilling to venture into time period before 1859 or after 1866, apart from brief references to either the *Statuto* or the Franco-Prussian War; those who did were often able to develop and explain the role of Victor Emmanuel more fully. The question did not ask whether Victor Emmanuel was the most significant individual but asked 'how significant?' he was in promoting Italian unification. Most candidates chose to develop significance by comparing Victor Emmanuel with other individuals/factors but many more successful answers evaluated his contribution or lack of contribution directly through a process of a yes/no response. Many of the responses which used the comparative method tended to dismiss Victor Emmanuel's role quite quickly moving on to a prepared response about other individuals which gained mid-level 4 at the most. There were a few responses that dismissed his role almost out-of-hand and so could not move out of level 3; Victor Emmanuel is one of the few specified individual in the 'bullet points' and his role should, therefore, be studied explicitly. Most candidates identified him as a figurehead rather than a driver of unification. At level 5 candidates were able to show the role of Victor Emmanuel across the whole period and to discuss the role that he played at different times and the influence which he had, both directly and indirectly, on other individuals. Many of the better responses were able to identify 'promote' as a key word and discuss his contribution in terms of active support.

This is a level 5 response.

Put a cross in the box indicating the FIRST question you have chosen to answer .
If you change your mind, put a line through the box
and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

(This page is for your first answer.)

Intro - 9 states
Venna - Austrian influence

P1 - progress made → 1848 started
→ provisional governments esp. Roman Republic 1849

P2 - no progress → still large Austrian influence prov. govts fell
→ lack of actual unity → Austria (plus hereditary states) → 1848 war
↳ brief collaboration of Modena + Parma 1848
→ no unification

P3 - no progress → lack of actual unity
↳ brief collaboration only
Modena + Parma
→ no unification

P4 - no progress → diff. aims
→ lack of popular support

1849

(This page is for your first answer.) By ~~1845~~, Italy had undergone three sets of revolutions starting in 1820-1 with revolutions in Piedmont, Naples & Sicily to 1831-2 with revolutions in Parma, Modena and the Papal States to 1848 in which almost every Italian state had some form of revolution. However, during this time we must decide whether the terms of the Vienna Settlement 1815 had at all been overthrown in that Italy either removed Austrian influence or managed to unify its & more separate states.

Firstly, it is clear that some progress was made. For example, following the 1848 war in Piedmont against Austria, Charles Albert, King of Piedmont, granted a constitution, the Statuto. This marked a definite move away from Austrian influence as it showed Piedmont becoming independent. Although limited, of course, and barely democratic (only a very small percentage of the population were granted the vote) the Statuto marked a clear change and showed Piedmont as a strong base for possible future unification. The Statuto survived after 1848 and went on to become the basis for the Italian constitution. Further progress was also seen in

(This page is for your first answer.) The numerous (shortlived) provisional governments that were established throughout this period especially in the Roman Republic, led by Mazzini, which held out for 100 days during which time several reforms were made including tax reforms and the removal of the death penalty. While of course, the Roman Republic was also crushed, its brief success gave hope to the Risorgimento and the taste of Italian independence to the nationalist movement in Italy. It is therefore clear, that in some ways especially in the move away from Austrian influence, the terms of the Congress of Vienna were in somewhat overturned.

However, this was not entirely the case. Austria retained a stronghold over the Italian peninsula. We must remember that all three sets of revolutions failed and this is mostly due to Austrian intervention. Austria throughout this period exercised its strength over Italy, crushing almost every revolution, dispersing revolutionaries and restoring the monarchs put in place following the 1815 Congress of Vienna. Any progress that had been made was quickly reverted and although not entirely as it had been in

(This page is for your first answer.) 1815, Austria succeeded in keeping its influence strong in Italy right up to 1849. This was also seen in the Austrian victory over the Piedmontese in 1848 and the continuing ~~power~~ strength of the Austrian army.

In other areas of the 1815 settlement, too, Italy remained the same. The Congress of Vienna had sought to deter nationalist feeling by redrawing Italy into ^{more} separate states, each with different leaders and governments. The revolutions up to 1849 strongly reflect this lack of unity in the complete lack of cooperation between the states. Even by comparing the revolutions, it is clear that there was little coordination on the part of the revolutionaries. A whole ten years passed between the revolutions of the 1820s and 1830s. It is doubtful that they can even be linked strongly, erupting in completely different states to those from before. Furthermore, excluding the brief appointment of a joint military commander for Modena and Parma in 1831, there was no collaboration whatsoever during these early attempts at revolution. In fact, the period saw no attempt at any ~~sort of~~ unification despite the ideas of writers such as Mazzini.

(This page is for your first answer.) Overthrown.

In conclusion, as explained, Italy on the whole failed to overthrow the provisions made in 1815. Other than the Statute and the establishment of the Roman Republic in 1849, little progress was made in throwing off the chains of Austrian influence as Italy remained oppressed by the Austrian government and Army. Of course, things were beginning to change with the growth of nationalism but it is clear that it was not until later years that any significant progress was made in violating the orders made in 1815 or removing Austrian influence.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response is directly focused on the question asked. It considers a range of issues which affected the provisions of the Vienna Settlement between 1815-1849 using well selected supporting material. This is a good example of an answer where the conclusion suggests that little change has actually changed but the candidate has found more than adequate supporting material to argue the case.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Some of the most effective answers are those that can clearly show change over time.

Topic E/F2 – The Unification of Germany, 1848-90

Once again this is a very popular topic and most of the candidates are very well prepared for the first three bullet points of the specification. Q3 was universally more popular and there were very few candidates who attempted Q4. It would appear, however, that some centres are neglecting to cover the whole of the content. Questions can cover single bullet points or multiple bullet points across the specification and may address any part of the time period from 1848-90. Centres who do not cover all of the content are in danger of limiting an already limited choice of questions for their candidates. As with topic 1, there are some factual errors beginning to creep into answers. Many candidates seem to believe that Bismarck was appointed in 1852 rather than 1862 and attribute him with the foundation of the *Zollverein*.

Q3. Most candidates were secure in their knowledge of the events leading to and the factors responsible for the unification process. There is also a clear understanding of the term 'diplomacy' in connection to Bismarck's foreign policy. Some candidates do refer to his 'diplomacy' on the domestic front but the earlier tendency to refer to this to the exclusion of foreign policy altogether is now very rare. However, as with Q2 the question did not ask whether his diplomacy was the 'most' significant factor but 'how significant' his diplomacy was. As a result there were many answers which seemed to consist of prepared answers which referred to all the factors in turn with a statement at the end as to which was most important. These answers were often list-like rather than discursive and, although often secure knowledge, lacking in an evaluation of the significance of Bismarck's diplomacy. There was also a tendency, as suggested in the general comments, to discuss events out of chronological order and with few dates to create a secure context. Most candidates suggested that Bismarck's diplomacy was very significant but that underlying factors allowed him to manipulate events. At Level 5 this approach was addressed directly with reference to longer term economic and military developments, the favourable international situation and 'chance'.

Q4. There were very few responses to this question. Responses tended to be either very strong or very weak. Many of the weaker responses tended to narrate events from 1871-90 or to evaluate the successes and failure of *Kulturkampf*. However, examiners did see some very confident answers which were able to evaluate change over time clearly. The timeframe allowed candidates to chart the move from the political alliance of the 'liberal era' through the more conservative/protectionist 1880s to the more complicated relationship surrounding Bismarck's fall.

Below is a script in which both answers reach Level 5.

Put a cross in the box indicating the FIRST question you have chosen to answer ☒.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒
and then put a cross in another box ☒.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

(This page is for your first answer.) *The figure of Victor Emmanuel is*

that of a man who, although moderately important in the unification process, was not especially significant, certainly when compared to Cavour and Garibaldi.

Victor Emmanuel's time on the throne of Piedmont was one in which Piedmontese power greatly expanded.

Despite his own personal inclinations, the Statute of 1848 was kept in force - and Piedmont thus became a beacon

for Liberals and Nationalists across Italy. Victor Emmanuel was,

in contrast to his predecessor - Charles Albert - willing to let

(This page is for your first answer.) The everyday running of the Kingdom he left to politicians, and he was also no opportunistic adventurer. Victor Emmanuel can be said to have been held as an important figurehead and rock of relative stability, therefore.

Yet, Victor Emmanuel was not far from the perfect monarch of a unified Italy. He seemed to show very little interest in the unification project - as is shown by his title (as the first King of Italy) - Victor Emmanuel II. He could also be autocratic, and came close to ruining Piedmont's interests - notably by ensuring the removal of Cavour from power and acceptance of nearly peace terms at Villafranca. By influence Victor Emmanuel did have, was therefore, neutral at best to the unification project.

However, the Prime Minister of Piedmont for much of

(This page is for your first answer.) This period - Camillo Benso di Cavour,

had a ~~mass~~ large influence on the unification process. Cavour's

(informal) sponsorship of the National Society led to the growth of liberalism

and Nationalism in Piedmont. He helped, through fixing up

trade and through subsidy, to ensure Piedmontese industrial

growth in the 1850s - so that Piedmont would become a 'worthy

ally of France. It was ^{one of} Cavour's personal great victories over

Victor Emmanuel that the Statute was retained. Domestically, therefore,

Cavour was vital to ~~an~~ Piedmont.

Cavour was thus, able to exercise his skill as a consummate

realpolitiker - utterly without principle, and interested only in his own

state's success. His alliance with Napoleon at Plombières can be

held as perhaps the most important single moment in

(This page is for your first answer.) unification. Cavour was able (at the cost of
Nice and Savoy - to the dismay of Victor Emmanuel) to secure French support.
As the events of 1848/9 showed, Italy 'could not make itself'. It was the French
military muscle which led to the expulsion of the Austrians from
Lombardy. Cavour was also able to, after Victor Emmanuel's
fecklessness, annex the Central Duchies to Piedmont. It was
(in the name of Victor Emmanuel) that Cavour who created
a 'Kingdom of North Italy' and Cavour would probably have been content to
stop there.

It was, therefore, the genius of one man - Giuseppe
Garibaldi - which led to the union of North and South. Piedmontese
opinion, including that of Victor Emmanuel that 'Africa begins at Rome' had
little effect on the Mazzinian idealist and romantic - Garibaldi. Through his

(This page is for your first answer.) ~~own~~ amazing charisma, as well as brilliant guerrilla tactics (Becker reckons him to be the 'greatest guerrilla leader of all time') Garibaldi was able to ~~conquer~~ conquer the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies. It is hard to imagine full unification taking place without Garibaldi's influence. The handover at Teano (despite Cavour's wish to 'exterminate the redshirts') made the myth of a partnership between Garibaldi and Victor Emmanuel.

The so-called 'international constitution' must also be mentioned. Cavour would not, of course, have been able to exercise his realpolitik without it. It was French intervention which led to the establishment of the Kingdom of North Italy - and the annexation of Venetia was a direct result of the peace settlement after the Austro-Prussian war. The taking of Rome was only facilitated because of

(This page is for your first answer.) French withdrawal from the city due to the Franco-Prussian war, and without the passive support of the British navy Garibaldi ~~or~~ wouldn't have been able to cross the State of Mexico. It can therefore be said that, were it not for the uniquely propitious international scene following the disintegration of the 'concert of Europe' in 1898 that Virification could never have happened.

Victor Emmanuel's significance, therefore, was largely symbolic - as the figurehead of a victorious Piedmont. It was ^{and often legitimist} after in spite of his (autocratic) wishes that Cavour could exercise his realpolitik and he was fortunate enough to have 'the South' herded to him on a plate. After the ^{death} departure of Cavour, all the major steps to full unification were ~

(This page is for your first answer.) ... result of the international scene and Victor

Emmanuel's attempt to defeat the Austrians at the Second Battle of Lutzen shows that he, in fact, was really the figurehead

of unification. It is certain that, even with the fortunate

constellation, without Tarnow's realpolitik and Gorchakoff's ^{nifty} genius

(both of which he initially resented), ~~then~~ Victor Emmanuel

couldn't have brought about unification.

Put a cross in the box indicating the SECOND question you have chosen to answer ☒.
Your second question choice must be on a different topic to your first question choice.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒
and then put a cross in another box ☒.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

(This page is for your second answer.)

Bismarck's diplomacy
was perhaps the single greatest factor in German unification,
despite the importance of other factors, such as Bismarck's own ^{domestic} political
achievements. These did, however, facilitate his diplomacy and there were other
factors which led to his plans being brought to fruition.
Bismarck's diplomacy ^{is} perhaps the best possible example of
successful realpolitik - the utterly ruthless and amoral pursuit of the interest of his own
state. Bismarck was able to prevent the invasion of Schleswig-Holstein
(along with Austria) so the enforcement of international law. He also, in his
meeting with Napoleon III at Biarritz, ensured that France would remain
neutral in the Austro-Prussian war, whilst allying with Italy, ensuring that

(This page is for your second answer.) The Austrian army would be split.

He also used the Hohenzollern candidacy as a way in which to antagonise France into the war - particularly to know that his publication of the edited Ems telegram would infuriate the likes of Louis Ollivier and Napoleon III. In doing this, Bismarck was able to kill two birds with one stone - to become a definite, aggressive 'other' which all Germans could rally behind, and the French invasion led to the activation of the North-South defensive military treaty. It can therefore be (fairly safely) said that without Bismarck's diplomacy, the war which forged the German state and the subsequent outcomes of the wars could never have happened.

However, were it not for Bismarck's shrewdly of

(This page is for your second answer.) The army reform crisis of 1858-62,

the Prussian army would not have been able to defeat the

Austrian and French armies. Von Roon's measures were only

passed as a result of Bismarck's bypassing of the 'landtag'.

The needle gun - which could fire five times more quickly than

its Austrian equivalent - was vital in the Austro-Prussian war.

Similarly, the (steel) rifled cannon in use in the Franco-

Prussian war, as well as the extra Prussian numbers, gave

Prussia a competitive edge over the only half-reformed

French army. If Bismarck had not acted ruthlessly in

domestic politics, therefore, all his diplomacy would have been in

vain.

However, the Prussian victories were, essentially, enabled

(This page is for your second answer.) only because of the blunders of Prussia's

enemies. Had Bismarck attacked the Prussian centre when two-fifths of the Prussian army had failed to turn up at Sadowa, the course of history would have been very different.

Similarly, Bazaine (who was, in fact, late but for treason on account of this) withdrew the French army to Metz, where, to quote one French general, they were surrounded by Prussian iron on ridges and 'were in the chicken pot and were going to be shot on'. Bismarck's diplomacy would also have come to nothing were it not for the circumstantial errors of his opponents.

Bismarck's opponents also condemned themselves due to their diplomatic mistakes. Austria, for example, cut itself off from its greatest ally, Russia as a result of its

(This page is for your second answer.) neutrality in the Franco War. The Danish government foolishly continued to fight on in Schleswig-Holstein and the French, having deployed hundreds of thousands of troops to France and Mexico, allowed themselves to be incensed and go to war over a seemingly trivial matter of honour - the Ems Telegram. Bismarck was therefore, although a brilliant diplomatic force, dealt a very good hand.

Some have also considered Bismarck's rise to have only been enabled through Prussia's economic growth. It was nothing to do with Bismarck that Austria was excluded from the Schleswig (which some have labelled 'Kleindeutschland-in-embryo'). Although it is true that without an expanding the and industrial base Bismarck would have been unable

(This page is for your second answer.) to ~~any~~ carry out the Prussian army reforms,

the fact that Austria could have won at Sedan and that

the French economy was slightly larger than Prussia's

upon the eve of the Franco-Prussian war means that it must be

counted as ^{the most important} a major factor.

Bismarck's diplomacy was, quite simply, the

key to German unification. He was able to, as a result of

it, manipulate his enemies (for example in Austria '64-6) and

put Prussia into a position where it could safely declare

war. All of Bismarck's subsequent masterly moves, such as the

establishment of the North German Confederation and the Reich

stem from this. However, were it not for an expanding economy,

which facilitated Bismarck's enforcement of army reform, as well as

(This page is for your second answer.) the long- and short-term mistakes of his enemies, it is unlikely that Bismarck could have earned through unification. Bismarck's realpolitik was, therefore, far said to be ~~was~~ the single factor which most engineered unification, but this was enabled through his own domestic political skill and the 'international constellation in place at the time, and was only brought to fruition as a result of the diplomatic foolishness of others, and the military ineptitude of Bazaine and Benedek. Bismarck, the architect of the German nation, was, in reality, only able to take his place in history as a result of those men.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Both of these answers are directly focused on the significance of the individual/issue highlighted in the question. Significance is established through a discussion of the individual/issue involved in comparison to other factors. Despite other factors being discussed the reader is always aware of their significance in comparison to the highlighted individual or issue.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Conclusions - an evaluative conclusion reaches a judgement and/or shows how the different factors/issues discussed in the main body of the essay are interconnected. Both of these conclusion show how it is possible to interlink factors succinctly and convincingly.

Topic E/F3 – The Collapse of the Liberal State and the triumph of Fascism in Italy, 1896-1943

Both questions were popular and it has been a pleasure to see the improvement in candidates' understanding and knowledge of the Liberal State since the first examination. However, there are still issues of chronological awareness with this topic with many candidates treating the years 1896 to 1915 as a homogenous whole and many responses unable to differentiate between the years 1925-43 and Mussolini's rise to power.

Q5. Most candidates were aware of the key issues relating to the political instability of the Liberal State in the years 1896-1922 but many responses seemed to be essentially prepared answers listing each of the underlying factors involved with little real discussion of the given factor. The concept of Italy's search for 'great power' status is outlined in the specification and, although the majority of the responses did highlight Italy's foreign policy, a significant minority of candidates assumed the term 'great power' referred almost exclusively to Italian domestic policy combined with the effects of World War I; this minimal approach to the given factor resulted in many lower band level 4 responses. The timeframe of the question allowed candidates to discuss a variety of foreign policy events including the defeat at Adowa, the war over Libya and World War I in relation to political instability and those responses that discussed these in comparison to other factors were able to access the higher levels. Some of the most successful answers were also able to show the changing nature of the threats to the Liberal State over time.

Q6. The majority of responses were able to explain and develop the role of propaganda in establishing Fascist control over Italy during the years 1925-43 but with differing degrees of detail. Fewer responses considered the extent to which 'effective propaganda' was the basis of Fascist control. Many candidates suggested that the cult of the personality combined with the positive propaganda surrounding Fascist policies were more effective than the use of intimidation and violence. Other responses discussed Fascist attempts to control or co-opt the elites of Italian society. However, a significant number of responses referred exclusively to the activities of Mussolini and/or were unsure of the timeframe of the question with emphasis on the rise of Fascism in the years 1919-25.

(This page is for your first answer.)

How significant was Victor Emmanuel in promoting Italian Unification in the years 1850-70?

In 1850, the Italian peninsula was a collection of states, each with their own rulers, languages and traditions. However in just twenty years those states had become united, under a king: Victor Emmanuel II. His Piedmont had been at the forefront of the push for unification, and under his reign they had annexed the other states and were now united, ~~they had~~ to comprise the kingdom of Italy. While Victor Emmanuel was important in promoting Italian Unification, he was by no means the only contributor. Significant roles were undertaken by Cavour, Napoleon and Garibaldi.

Victor Emmanuel ^{of Piedmont} II took to the throne in 1851, following his father, Charles Albert's abdication. It was under his reign that Piedmont's power grew, and ~~it became~~ and by ~~1860~~ ¹⁸⁵⁹ it was the only state capable of challenging Austrian influence. Victor Emmanuel's Piedmont were an ally of France in the Crimean War (1854-56) and this effort earned them a ~~per~~ seat at the peace table, which led to the Plombières meeting. While VE II was important, Italy needed a king to unite under, much of Piedmont's strength came from the

(This page is for your first answer.) Leadership of Camillo Cavour, ~~the~~ However Victor Emmanuel role should not be understated. His speeches were inspiring during the Second War of Italian Independence and it was his troops that took the Papal states before Garibaldi could attack Rome. His leadership also was key in Garibaldi handing over the seized territories, as Garibaldi, who had become a royalist, ~~was~~ ~~was~~ was amicable in handing over the south to the king. ~~while~~ ^{however} ~~while~~ VE II was quite significant, he was not the most important individual.

Cavour, the former finance minister, became prime minister in 1852, and under his guidance Piedmont flourished, Cavour had expert knowledge of industrialisation and ~~the~~ ~~in~~ Piedmont grew, foreign trade increased by 300% and Piedmont had a third of all railway track in the Italian peninsula. Not only did Cavour increase the economic capabilities of Piedmont, his decision to enter the Crimean War proved vital in the unification process. This was because he had made Piedmont a powerful ally in Napoleon III and this alliance proved vital in the eventual unification. As both Cavour and VE II ~~had~~ both had significant power in Piedmont, it is hard to determine who was responsible for what. However, the Plombières meeting (1858) is a fine example of what Cavour made the big decisions. Cavour met Napoleon at Plombières in July 1858 and it is thought the decisions made, were very similar to the agenda Cavour brought with him. With Piedmont

(This page is for your first answer.) and France in agreement over war with Austria, Cavour informed VE II of the outcome in a letter. This is an example of Cavour's significance, while Cavour died in 1861, his impact was decisive. He had set Italy on the path of unification and his impact was most significant, ~~However~~ however there were also other significant contributors.

Napoleon was incredibly important and his role was integral to the unification process. Napoleon sent 200,000 troops to join Piedmont's 100,000 in the second war of independence (1859). Not only did he support Piedmont in war, he was also important in Piedmont's decision to go to war, as he promised at Plombières to support Piedmont providing they had a just reason. In 1866 Napoleon almost single handedly brought about the annexation of Venetia as he made secret deals with both Prussia and Austria that promised neutrality in return for Venetia. On the other hand Napoleon also was in some ways an obstacle to unification as his troops remained in Rome following the 1849 Roman Republic, and they prevented two further attempts on Rome (1862 & 1867). Overall Napoleon's positive contribution outweighs his negative but while he was a major contributor, Cavour was more significant.

It is arguable that the only reason full unification

(This page is for your first answer.) came about, ~~was~~ and not just the unification of the north, was Garibaldi. Garibaldi had 'against all odds, managed to take Sicily and Naples in the space of 5 months in 1860. Heavily outnumbered in Sicily, Garibaldi's great leadership, guerilla tactics combined with the chaos of an earlier revolution in Palermo, allowed him to seize the island and become Dictator of Sicily. He then went on to secure the mainland in Naples and it was this action that prompted Piedmont to move down and take the Papal states. Garibaldi officially handed the south over to ~~Piedmont~~ VE II on November 8th 1860, and without him unification might have been restricted to just the north.

In conclusion VE II was somewhat significant in promoting Italian unity. He was a good leader and his army took the Papal states. However most of the work done in Piedmont was down to Cavour. He industrialised, gained allies and made crucial decisions such as preventing Garibaldi from taking Rome. VE II did add to Cavour's work, and after Cavour's death, he was the main source of power from Piedmont. Unification was heavily aided by Napoleon III's contribution, notably in Venetia and total unification may not have happened were it not ~~not~~ for Garibaldi. Victor Emmanuel did have some significance but he was the most important individual, that was Camillo Cavour.

Put a cross in the box indicating the SECOND question you have chosen to answer ☒.
Your second question choice must be on a different topic to your first question choice.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒
and then put a cross in another box ☒.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1	<input type="checkbox"/>	Question 2	<input type="checkbox"/>	Question 3	<input type="checkbox"/>
Question 4	<input type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6	<input type="checkbox"/>
Question 7	<input type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input type="checkbox"/>	Question 9	<input type="checkbox"/>
Question 10	<input type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input type="checkbox"/>	Question 12	<input type="checkbox"/>

(This page is for your second answer.)

Collapse of liberal state

1. Great Power & War
2. Weak political system
3. Early problems
4. Liberal failings

The political instability in Italy Liberal Italy was evident very evident. Between 1870 and 1922, Italy had 29 prime ministers. ~~Fascism was only able to triumph because Liberal Italy~~ ^{social} divisions were growing & ~~coalition governments were constantly failing~~ to compromise and Italy remained a divided country. Italy had desired to become a great power for a long time and this need to be considered on terms with Britain and France was key to the involvement in war and ultimately the falling of Liberal Italy and the triumph of fascism. However the political

(This page is for your second answer.) Instability was not just a result of the desire to be a European power, internal problems and divisions, as well as a lack of identity and a weak political system meant that the failing of Liberal Italy was almost inevitable.

~~Nationalists were keen on Italy becoming~~ Italian nationalists were constantly calling for a more aggressive foreign policy. They wanted to return Italy to her former glory and they thought that an empire would be a good start. While an attempt on Abyssinia (1896) failed, Italy gained Libya in 1911. Italy's decision to enter the First World War was ultimately because it wanted to gain territory and hence prove she was a powerful country. The decision to go to war was a grave error as Italy lost 600,000 men and 1,000,000 were wounded. The economic impact was equally terrible, ~~debt~~ national debt rose from 14 billion lira in 1914 to 85 billion in 1919 and inflation resulted as the government just printed more money. Italy's desire to be considered a power had cost them dearly and this was a major factor in the political instability. Furthermore the Treaty of Versailles and other settlements failed to award Italy Fiume, Dalmatia or any of Germany's African colonies. Nationalists blamed the liberals and this stigmatised a decline in stability, however other factors were also important.

Much of the political instability stemmed from the weaknesses of the political system. Italian politics relied on *Trasformismo*

(This page is for your second answer.) and the Liberals were usually propped up in Coalitions by other groups. This meant little was actually achieved and many coalitions ended over petty disagreements. Other political groups emerged and in 1921 the Socialists gained more seats (156) than any other party or group. One result of the weak political system was parties polarised, unable to compromise in the middle, people moved further left or right and with the emergence of radical parties, compromises and coalitions were even harder to make. This political system, therefore, was partly responsible for the instability in Italy.

It could be argued that political instability was inevitable. In 1870, on completion of Unification, it was remarked, "We have built Italy, now we must build Italians" and this problem of lack of national identity was important. Coalities were more family orientated and only 2% of the population spoke Italian. Another problem inherited by liberal Italy was the North-South divide, poverty of the South. In Sicily 0.01% of the people owned 50% of the land and the rest lived in poverty. Most of Italy (68%) relied on agriculture and Italy, which was mainly unindustrialised, was a poor country which lacked in any real natural resources such as coal or iron ore. Therefore a major factor in the political instability were the problems that dated back to unification.

(This page is for your second answer.) It could also be argued that the failure of the Liberals was directly responsible for the crisis Italy faced. While Liberals had inherited a dire situation, they didn't fix many of the problems. Despite a growth in national income from 61 billion lira to 92 billion lira between 1895 and 1915, Italian workers had comparatively low wages ~~so~~ and longer hours than most of the rest of Western Europe. This wealth was squandered on foreign endeavours and the socialists and they felt the working class had been continued to be exploited. Moreover the Liberal government was blamed for the 'Mutilated Victory' of the peace settlements. The Liberals had reduced taxes and increased industrialisation of the north, but this increased the prosperity gap between the North and South and created more class divisions between the middle class employers and working class employees.

In conclusion Italy's attempt to become a superpower was to some extent to blame for the political instability. However it was not the only factor. The weak political system meant it was harder to make progress and coalitions and compromises were obstacles to real change. It could also be argued that political instability was inevitable after the inherited problems associated with unification. While the Liberal government did not succeed, their failure was not the overwhelming reason, and success

(This page is for your second answer.) ... was nearly impossible in a world with the inherent problems and weak political system. Overall it was the desire to be a ~~super~~ power and the resulting war that proved most significant. If the early problems made stability hard, war and the quest to be a power made stability impossible.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Both answers are directly focused on the question asked, have explicit understanding of the key issues and supported with relevant and detailed knowledge. Each essay begins with a solid and relevant introduction, is developed through discursive paragraphs and reaches a judgement. Both are well organised and well written.

Topic E/F4 – Republicanism, Civil War and Francoism in Spain, 1931-75.

This topic is growing in popularity and candidates are increasingly well prepared. However, examiners commented on the lack of secure knowledge of the chronology of events covered by both questions. Q7 was by far the most popular question with very few answers attempted for Q8.

Q7. The majority of candidates who answered this question were able to develop the given factor with some confidence. However many responses tended to describe foreign support in the Civil Wars in general rather than in specific relation to its importance in securing Nationalist success or at a slightly higher level wrote a list-like response of developed paragraphs about different factors with little attempt at evaluation. There were also weaknesses in chronological awareness. For example, the airlift of the Army of Africa was often mentioned after examples of German aid given later in the war with little regard for its role in saving the Nationalists from an early defeat. The best responses were those which were able to show that foreign intervention not only aided success but had different consequences at different time of the war, as well as evaluating the importance of foreign intervention in relation to other factors. Despite good knowledge of the factors contributing to Republican failure and Nationalist success, candidates would benefit from a better overview of the progress of the war during its different stages.

Q8. This was only attempted by a minority of candidates. Examiners noted that the better responses were able to show change over time confidently and clearly and were able to come reasoned judgements which suggested that despite some amelioration of control there was still a great deal of underlying repression and highlighted the growing tension in the early 1970s. Weaker responses often found it difficult to define repression and there were a few answers which answered the question exclusively with reference to the late 1930s and 1940s.

Topic E/F5 – Germany Divided and Reunited, 1945-91

Centres which cover this topic invariably prepare their candidates well but once again it is clear that many candidates have a weak understanding of the chronological order of events and are unaware of the key dates with regard to turning points in the development of Germany post-war. There are a worrying number of candidates who confuse the Berlin Airlift, the building of the Berlin Wall and the fall of the Berlin Wall. However, most candidates deal well with the different events in West and East Germany and are aware of the separate patterns of development. Q9 was overwhelmingly more popular with very few candidates addressing the question of why events in Berlin were so important to the relationship between the two parts of Germany during the post-war period.

Q.9 Most candidates were secure in their knowledge of the role of Adenauer in the economic development of post-war Germany. They were able to refer both to specific examples of his influence over economic policy and his symbolic role as the head of the newly established Federal Republic. Many responses were also aware of other possible factors affecting economic growth and prosperity citing the role of Erhard, support from Western powers, the underlying strength of the German economy and the impetus gained from the supplying of resources for the Korean War. However, many answers remained at low-to-mid level 4 as they developed but did not convincingly evaluate the importance of Adenauer in comparison to the other possible factors. The best answers were able to show Adenauer's underlying importance interlinked to the other factors. Some of the best answers also address the different concepts of 'economic growth' and 'prosperity'.

Topic E6/F6 – The Middle East, 1945-2001: The State of Israel and Arab Nationalism

This is a relatively popular topic but candidates often seem confused as the chronology of events and the dates of the key turning points. Answers on the pre-1979 period are often a narrative-driven commentary on the Arab-Israeli wars and candidates often feel the need to mention the wars even in a question which is firmly based in the period 1945-48 or post-1979. Candidates often also seem very hesitant to answer questions which do not refer directly to the events surrounding the creation of Israel or the Arab-Israeli conflict. Centres should note that these are only directly covered in two out of the four bullet points in the specification and that all bullet points need to be covered to ensure that candidates have even a choice of questions to answer. Questions can be set on individual bullet points or any combination of bullet points joined together. Q11 was by far the most popular question with few candidates attempting Q12. Those who did were often confused over the chronology of events and found it difficult to define the concept of self-interest. There were some good responses, however, which were able to focus on Arab disunity rather than Arab-Israeli conflicts. These answers discussed the role of Egypt in pan-Arab attempts to create unity, the difficulties created for individual states by Palestinian refugees, the significance of individuals such as Nasser and Sadat and the geo-political tensions of the region in general.

Q11. Most candidates were aware of the different factors influencing the creation of the state of Israel in 1948. Some candidates dismissed almost out-of-hand the role of American influences discussing only other factors and these responses could only reach high Level 3 at best. There were also a significant minority of answers that could only develop points generally with little specific reference to the events of the years 1945-48; discussing

the impact of the holocaust and the growth of Zionism in general terms. The majority of candidates, however, were able to develop their knowledge of American support but with varying degrees of detail. 'American support' was given a wide definition with responses referring to the role of American Jews, American business, politicians and President Truman. Many responses were made up of a series of paragraphs about the different factors leading to the creation of Israel but only those which attempted some evaluation or judgement were able to progress into the higher levels. Some excellent responses suggested that, while the more direct influences of British mandatory rule, terrorism and the UN played a major part, the underlying influence of American support was vitally important in giving Jewish leaders the confidence to declare the state of Israel.

This is a level 5 script. Both responses have direct focus on the question and have explicit understanding of the key issues.

Put a cross in the box indicating the FIRST question you have chosen to answer ☒.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒
and then put a cross in another box ☒.

Chosen Question Number:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

(This page is for your first answer.)

Plan:

1) Attempt at great Power:

- * adowa failure.
- * Libya alienates Socialists
- * WW1 failures (mutilated victory + cap.)

2) Trasformismo

- * weak gov.
- * allowed to flourish
- * Easy to topple gov.

3) Challenges of Socialism + Nationalism

4) Rise of Fascism

(This page is for your first answer.)

During the period 1896-1922, the Liberal State in Italy attempted to use foreign policy to heal the social and political divides in Italy, that had been present since unification in 1870. However, the failure of the campaign in Abyssinia and in WW1 greatly affected the stability of Liberal Italy and pushed it to the point of collapse. By 1922, Mussolini had taken power and while the disastrous foreign policy destabilised the state, political challenges and weak governments ~~it~~ also led to instability in political Italy.

The Liberals hoped foreign victories would help unite a divided population. However from 1896 these campaigns often did more harm than good. The defeat in the battle of Adowa humiliated the Liberals and led to the emergence of a strong nationalist movement that would challenge the Liberals in the 20th century thus causing instability. Also this defeat was used by the fascists to display the Liberals' weaknesses and thus had a destabilizing effect further down the line. Also, PM Giolitti's decision to invade Libya in 1911 also caused instability as it alienated the socialists and led to Socialism's more anti-Liberal stance in the 1910's and 20's. However, the most destabilizing effect was felt in the aftermath of WW1. The Liberals attempted to become a great

(This page is for your first answer.) Power through world war one was thwarted due to major defeats such as Caporetto in 1917. Like in 1896, the population was humiliated by Italy's poor foreign conflict and this led to an offshoot of Nationalism from more extreme moderates to join Nationalism and this undoubtedly strengthened the Nationalists. The mutilated victory destroyed stability even more. The inability of Orlando to secure the land he was promised in London in 1915 led to the public seeking a more extreme brand of politics which increased the opposition to the Liberals and so decreased stability. It is also important to note that WW1 divided the Liberals between Salandra and anti-war Giolitti. These divisions would allow Mussolini to rise to power by 1922 and so increase instability in Italy's politics. Italy's desire to be a great power increased instability as it divided the Italian people and government and increased opposition to the Liberal state.

However, while the foreign policy of the Liberal state increased opposition, the opposition itself caused mass instability in Italian politics. By 1900 the Socialists had 32 seats in government and the rise of Socialism would have a great effect on the stability of the state. Socialists demands for more reforms after Giolitti's 1911 social reforms split Liberals and alienated Nationalists

(This page is for your first answer.) as they opposed the Pro-Socialist Policy. Socialism also carried out the Biennio Rosso of 1919-1920 and occupation of the factories and this destabilized Italian politics as Giolitti seemed incapable of quelling these socialist outbursts. Also as Socialism became the largest party in 1919 they began to challenge the Liberals position and caused instability in the Liberal regime. Another cause of instability was the Pope. His anti-liberal state views, alienated Catholics from the Italian Political spectrum and ~~and~~ without the support of this mass group the Liberal State was weak and open to the threat of Socialism. The failure of the Liberals to answer the 'Roman Question' only increased instability as moderate Catholics turned to a party who promised to resolve the threat of Socialism and the 'Roman Question', the Fascists. The challenges of the church and Socialism destabilized Italian politics as there was now a legitimate challenge to the Liberals, the Socialists, and their activism and anti-liberal stance while the largest party ~~increased~~ ^{increased} instability in Italian politics while the church's lack of support drove people away from the Liberal State and reduced its power base.

However, from 1919, Fascism would emerge as a serious challenge to the Liberals. Mussolini's anti-liberal

(This page is for your first answer.) Stance ~~and~~ reduced support for the Liberals and his aggressive demands over being made PM in 1922 pushed the Liberal state to breaking point and led to the instability that would lead to Liberal Italy's collapse. The Fascist's use of violence also destabilized Italian politics with a civil war developing between Socialism and Fascism and with Fascist occupations such as in Ferrara and Bologna in 1921. This increased Fascist power in the localities and built local resentment of Liberalism thus destabilizing the Liberal regime. However, it was the March on Rome that created the most instability. This divided the King and the PM Nitti and with these divisions Mussolini would take power in 1922. The Fascist policies 1919-1922 destabilized Italian politics as it removed Liberal support from the localities, created a rivalry with Socialism and with acts like the March on Rome it forced the Liberals to act under great pressure which would eventually lead to the Liberal collapse in Oct. 1922.

Finally, the underlying weaknesses of *Testamento* politics caused instability in Italian politics. These weak coalition governments meant Italy failed to make major economical advances in the years 1918-1922 and the fact the average PM's reign was 7 months shows how unstable Italy was due to *Testamento*

(This page is for your first answer.) Politics. Also the actions of Orlando to introduce universal suffrage ^{in 1912} increased instability as this increased the power extremism had in Italy post-WWI. The flourishing of trasformismo politics weakened Italy as it meant there was no strong leader to quell political challenges and so political rivals grew in the instability of Liberal Italy.

While the strength of political challenges and the weakness of trasformismo government introduced instability into Italy, the role of Italy's desire to be a great power was the most destabilizing factor to Italian politics from ~~1871~~ 1871-1922. The failed invasion of Abyssinia and the disappointment at WWI split the Liberals and increased opposition massively. Even successful foreign ventures drew the ire of Socialists. Therefore, the foreign policy of the Liberal state caused the most instability as it greatly increased opposition and weakened the Liberal position. Also, as Fascism, the party that took power in 1922, rose due to WWI the effect of Italy's foreign policy was clear to see by Oct. 1922.

Put a cross in the box indicating the SECOND question you have chosen to answer .
Your second question choice must be on a different topic to your first question choice.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box
and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

(This page is for your second answer.)

1) American Support

- Truman declaration, 1946

- Use of power in the UN

- report to Palestine in 1946

aid

2) Zionism

- Biltmore declaration

- Jewish lobby

- Lack of Arab body

3) Terrorism

- Murder of Lord Moyne (sterngay)

- Bombing of HQ, 1946

- Riots 1947 w/ Haganah

Hagging

4) British Policy

- Pro-Zionist Balfour + white Paper

- wanted to leave

- led to creation.

(This page is for your second answer.) Answer:

By 1948, David Ben-Gurion was Prime Minister of an independent state of Israel. This may have seemed a far way off at the end of WW11 however the increased support of the US and President Truman greatly aided the Zionists position and was a key factor in the creation of Israel. However, the Jewish homeland also became a reality due to the Holocaust and Zionism, the increase in terrorism from 1945-1948 and British policy in the region.

In 1945 the Zionists cause lacked the influential support required to make Israel a reality. The British were no longer the global superpower they once had been and so their support didn't greatly aid the Zionists. In this way the support of the US was crucial, as it gave Zionists a means to make Israel a reality as America had the power to help create a state in the aftermath of WW11. The Truman declaration of 1946 shows the extent of support the US gave and this support gave weight to the Zionists demands in the UN. The American government's report on Palestine in 1946 also benefitted as they declared the best option was to create a Jewish state. This American backing swung opinions in the UN as countries followed American policies in order to receive the backing of the US at the start of the Cold war. The Americans

(This page is for your second answer.) Use of Power in the UN

greatly helped advance the Zionists cause and the US had a great effect in creating the landslide votes for UN resolution 181 in 1947. The US support helped create an independent Israel as they gave the Jews the influential backing needed to make Israel a reality. The US also gave aid to Zionists and this allowed Jews to solidify their position in Palestine as civil war broke out in 1947.

However, the strengths of the Zionist movement gained US support so their effect on the creation of Israel must also be examined. The Zionists gave a strong united movement that gained the support of governments around the world. The gaining of this support made the dreams of an independent Jewish homeland a reality and so Zionists greatly advanced the Jewish cause. The Biltmore declaration of 1942 meant that US politicians started to back Zionism and by gaining this support the Zionist movement had made the Jewish homeland more likely. The Jewish Lobby in America was also used to great effect by the Zionists as they used their influence to swing the policies of US politicians so they increased the amount of support the Zionist cause had in America. The Zionists also used propaganda very well using the Holocaust to bring Jewish Diaspora

(This page is for your second answer.) to the world stage. The Zionist Propaganda gained the support Zionism had with the public not just politicians and so Zionism ~~was~~ ^{had} mass support by 1947 due to the Zionists use of the Holocaust to demand a homeland. The Zionist cause helped create the state of Israel as it swung the views of the public and politicians alike and gained the influential support needed to create a Jewish homeland.

While the Zionists used politics to try to create Israel, many Jews in Palestine resorted to terrorism to gain a homeland. In 1945, the Jewish Agency sanctioned the use of violence to drive Britain from ~~the~~ Palestine. The actions of the Stern gang reduced anti-Zionist voices in other countries through blackmail and assassinations such as the murder of Lord Moyne in 1946. The bombing of British HQ in 1946 and the hanging of British soldiers by the Irgun in 1947, turned British politicians and public against remaining in Palestine and under fear of more attacks or murders the British government pulled out of Palestine. It is important to note the reason they left Palestine was due to the violence caused by Jewish terrorists not the support of the US for a Jewish homeland. The violence in the Palestinian civil war in early 1948 also helped

(This page is for your second answer.) Secure an independent Israel as the Haganah took British weapons and military installations needed to maintain Israeli independence in the 1948 war. Terrorism was important in the creation of Israel as it drove the British from Palestine and left a power vacuum that would be filled with a Jewish homeland in 1948.

Finally as Britain held the mandate until 1947 their policy in the region had an effect on the creation of Israel. The British had tended to be pro-Zionist prior to 1945 with the Balfour declaration of 1917 promising Jews a homeland and the White Paper of 1939 confirming these aspirations. This meant Jewish immigration went unchecked for many years and this allowed Jews to strengthen their position in the region increasing the call for a homeland in Israel. The British decision to end the mandate in 1947 was also crucial. Without the British deciding to leave Palestine Israel would never have been created and so this decision was one of the most important factors in the creation of Israel in 1948. Therefore British policy aided the creation of the state of Israel as it gave the Jews the power base needed to demand a state and their decision to leave Palestine in 1947 was the trigger for the creation of Israel.

(This page is for your second answer.)

while American support for a homeland greatly aided the creation of Israel, the strengths of the Zionist movement were the most important factor in the creation of Israel in 1948. The Zionist movement was responsible for the support from America and they also garnered support from other influential countries and this assured that resolution 181 was passed in 1947. The lack of ^{support for the Arabs} ~~Arab support~~ due to the lack of ^{influential} ~~any~~ group searching for an Arab homeland in Palestine shows the strength of Zionism and without this movement the state of Israel may never have been created. Zionism was the most important factor in the creation of a Jewish homeland as it made the dream of a homeland a reality.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

Each of the paragraphs in these answers are connected to the previous points or develop the discussion being created. The paragraphs are well developed with appropriate and well selected material. The conclusions summarise the argument in the essays and weigh up the importance of the given factor while showing an understanding of change over time.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

A good introduction will show an understanding of the focus and will establish the context of the time frame of the question. The introduction to Q5 clearly does all of these things briefly but with enough detail.

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code US028130 June 2011

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit

www.edexcel.com/quals

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government



Rewarding Learning